(c) what was the bulk drug price taken into account for working out the formulation price;

(d) whether IDPL sold any quantity to non-associated formulators; and

(e) if so, what are the details thereof indicating the name of the party, the quantity and the price charged?

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL): (a) IDPL have not installed any capacity for the commercial manufacture of Glybanclamide. However, in course of Research and Development work in-house, certain quantity was produced and used.

(b) and (c) IDPL marketed the formulation under brand name of 'Idimide' based on Glybenclamide. The strength is 5 mg/tablet. IDPL follows the leader price of Rs. 6.65 (including excise duty) fixed for a pack of 10x10 tablets.

(d) and (e) As the IDPL did not undertake commercial production of Glybenclamide bulk, the question of sale of the same to any non-associated formulator does not arise.

Association of Multinationals or Non-resident Indains with construction of fertilizer plants

2308. SHRI K. VASUDEVA PANICKER: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state.

(a) whether any multinational firm or non-resident Indians are associated with the setting up of new fertilizer units under erection; and

(b) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL): (a) and (b) M/s. Caparo Group, London, has offered to set up a gas-based fertilizer project at Shahjahanpur in U.P., at an estimated cost of Rs. 620 crores, with 50 per cent of the equity as non-resident Indian investment.

Manufacture of drugs of doubtful validity

2309. SHRI RAJNI RANJAN SAHU: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 2826 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 22nd August, 1983 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the manufacturers are increasing production of formulations of doubtful validity which are exempted from price control;

(b) whether it is a fact that Government neither allowed re-endorsement nor instructed the companies to stop production;

(c) what was the production of each product for the previous three years, year-wise, as mentioned in the application for re-endorsement of capacity by each company and what was their production during 1984-85;

(d) what are the names of the formulations of each company of doubtful validity, based on imported and canalised bulk drugs;

(e) what was the consumption of each drug by each company during 1979-80 and 1984-85;

(f) what are the reasons for not putting restriction on their imports and allocations of canalised drugs;

(g) whether it is also a fact that companies are marketing without price approval and overcharging and expanding production unauthorisedly; and

(h) if so, what action was taken against them?